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Policy context:

- Developed against the 3Os Strategy: open science, open innovation and open to the world
- Priority to improve the quality and efficiency of national research and innovation policies.
- European Semester: 13 MS with CSR on research and innovation
- PSF: advise and evidence to implement the policy reforms
- PBFS an issue addressed within the European Semester and ERA Priority 1 (more effective national research systems).
Goal Policy Support Facility:

Help MS "improve the design, implementation and evaluation of R & I policies"

- Supporting evidence-based R&I policies
- Drawing on the combination of
  - the high potential of learning between peers (i.e. policy-makers)
  - and high-level experts advice and assistance
Why Policy Support Facility?

Launched in 2015 to do "better and more" policy support:

- Addresses limitations encountered so far in peer-review and mutual learning processes: the "better"
- Offer support to a broader range of policy-makers in structuring their policy reforms: the "more"
How?

- Peer Reviews of National R&I Systems
- Specific Support to Countries
- Mutual Learning Exercises
- PSF Knowledge Center
PSF Peer Reviews

In-depth assessments of a country's R&I system carried out by a panel of experts and leading to concrete recommendations to the national authorities on reforms necessary to strengthen their R&I system.

Moldova   Hungary   Bulgaria
Latvia     Ukraine
PSF Specific Support to countries

PSF specific support to countries aims at providing a set of concrete recommendations on how to tackle a specific R&I policy challenge and how to implement the accompanying reforms.

- **Malta**, on the best tools to monitor and evaluate the implementation of their national R&I strategy.
- **Slovakia**, on framework conditions for start-ups/ high growth innovative enterprises.
- **Romania**, on innovative entrepreneurship.
- **Slovenia**, on the internationalisation of science and higher education policies, and on the impact of R&I investments.
PSF Mutual Learning Exercises

Focussed on specific/operational R&I challenges of interest to several volunteering countries, and draw on a hands-on project-based exchange of good practice.

- **Administration and monitoring of R&D tax incentive**
  LV, PT, BE, HR, FR, NO, NL
  CY, LT, DE (observers)

- **Evaluation of business R&D grant schemes**
  NO, DK, ES, SE, TR
  HU, CZ, CY, DE, RO (observers)

- **Evaluation of complex public private partnerships**
  BE, NO, BG, SE
  ES, DE, HU (observers)

- **Alignment and Interoperability**
  FR, LT, DK, TK, NO, AT, PT, EE, SE, SI
  RO, DE (observers)

- **Performance-based funding of public research organisation**
  CZ, AT, CY, EE, NO, ES, SI, SE, PT, IT, TK

- **Public Innovation procurement**
  EL, LV, EE, AT, DE (confirmed)
Mutual Learning Exercises

- Focus on **policy challenge** that is of interest to several **volunteering** countries.

- It identifies **good practice, lessons learned and success factors** based on robust evidence about impacts of the measures and the contextual factors.

- With the aim to implement **change** in their specific policy mix.

- **Policy learning** approach: interested MS learn from each other exploring specific questions in more detail.

- With a **modular approach** & combination of activities (workshops, study visits, information sharing activities, etc...)

- High level advice and **assistance** from external experts
MLE Performance Based Funding Systems:
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The Horizon 2020 Policy Support Facility is a new instrument that gives Member States and countries associated to Horizon 2020 practical support to design, implement and evaluate reforms that enhance the quality of their research and innovation investments, policies and systems.

Such reforms concern, for example, the stimulation of stronger and closer links between science and business or the introduction of performance-based funding of public research institutes.

The Policy Support Facility provides Member States and countries associated to Horizon 2020 with access to independent high-level expertise and analyses through a number of services such as peer reviews of the national research and innovation systems, support to specific reforms or project-based mutual learning exercises.

**Peer Reviews**
Peer reviews of national M&I systems to detect strengths and weaknesses and recommend concrete paths for reforms.

**Specific support to countries**
Support to specific reforms, including pre-Peer Review horizon scanning, peer review evaluations, and other ad hoc requests.

**Mutual Learning Exercises**
Mutual learning on specific topics, involving a set of countries around a project targeting the exchange of practices for policy reform.

**Exercises Timeline**

**Upcoming PSF Events**
- Training regarding policy support - Bulgaria
  22 JUNE 2016
- Training regarding policy support - Portugal
  19 JULY 2016
- Lorem Ipsum dolor - Belgium
  16 JULY 2016
- Test test test - Spain
  22 JUNE 2016
- Lorem Ipsum dolor - Italy
  3 SEPTEMBER 2016

**News Corner**
14 JUNE 2016
Adoption of a topic for MLE project

3 JUNE 2016
Workshop with Member States (MS) on the Policy Support Facility (PSF)

[PSF Knowledge Center](https://rio.jrc.ec.europa.eu)
Alignment and Interoperability of research programmes

Policy Support Facility

Mutual Learning Exercise on Ex-post evaluation of business R&I grant schemes.

The Policy Support Facility provides Member States and countries associated to Horizon 2020 with access to independent high-level expertise and analyses through a number of services such as peer reviews of the national research and innovation systems, support to specific reforms or project-based mutual learning exercises.

Date  Tuesday, 23 February, 2016 to Thursday, 22 September, 2016
Exercise type  Mutual learning

Reports

Intermediate report

Occurring in the middle of a process. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

Occurring in the middle of a process. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat. Duis aute irure dolor in reprehenderit in voluptate velit esse cillum dolore eu fugiat nulla pariatur. Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.

Geo coverage  Overall perspective
Document type  EU Report or Publication
Report type  Efficiency of R&I systems
Report year  2016
Official publication date  Wednesday, 8 June, 2016
Report file  Download pdf

Meetings

Kick-off meeting

 diferen Monday, 30 May 2016
DG Research & Innovation rue Champs de Mars Brussels, Belgium

Meeting description - Feedback on the process itself. How does the context/subject matter impact the discussion? Previous and future expectations of the participants. Expectations of the participants. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat.

Show documents

Path: MIE Brussels 30-05-2016.pdf
Draft Agenda 30-05-2016.pdf
Test Doc 1.pdf
Presentation May pdf
Test Doc 2.pdf
Test Doc 3.pdf

Final workshop

 diferen Wednesday, 8 June 2016
DG Research & Innovation rue Champs de Mars Brussels, Belgium

Meeting description - Feedback on the process itself. How does the context/subject matter impact the discussion? Previous and future expectations of the participants. Expectations of the participants. Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat.

Show documents
Thank you

contact: RTD-PSF@ec.europa.eu
Mutual Learning Exercise on Performance based funding

Performance based funding: a comparative assessment of their use and nature in EU Member States

Koen Jonkers; Thomas Zacharewicz

Brussels, September 2016

Joint Research Centre
the European Commission’s in-house science service

JRC Science Hub: ec.europa.eu/jrc
Introduction

ERA priority 1: increasing the effectiveness and performance of public sector research systems

In the EC communication (2011) on "supporting growth and jobs – an agenda for the modernisation of Europe's higher education systems" the commission recommends the introduction of funding mechanisms linked to performance.

This report aims to inform the Horizon 2020 PSF Mutual Learning exercise on PBF.
A research performance based funding system bases the allocation of organisational level funding on the ex post assessment of research outputs.
Methodology

• The report is based on a comparative qualitative analysis of 35 national R&I systems. The analysis uses 2 types of information

• RIO Country reports 2014-2015 (+ national policy documents and scientific literature)

• Quantitative data collected in the framework of a project on Public Funding for Research (still under development)
## Dominant assessment approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No RPBF</th>
<th>Limited RPBF</th>
<th>Quantitative formula with Bibliometric assessment</th>
<th>Peer review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE (FI)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE (WA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education metrics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD graduates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU MS</th>
<th>Year implementation/revision RPBF</th>
<th>Agency Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>2002; 2013</td>
<td>BMWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (FL)</td>
<td>2003; 2006, 2012; 2014</td>
<td>EWI (BOF Key)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium (Wa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ARC/FSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MSES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>2013 (potential new change in 2015/2016)</td>
<td>CRDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Ministry of Education; Estonian Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1998/2010 / 2014</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>2008 / 2013</td>
<td>HCERES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2010, 2014</td>
<td>ANVUR (VQR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>2009, 2011 and 2012.</td>
<td>Minister of Education and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>MoESC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2008/2013</td>
<td>KEJN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>FCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>MESRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Swedish Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1986 (RAE), 2014(REF)</td>
<td>HEFCE (REF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Lander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
Effects of PBF

Share of publications among top 10% most cited (field weighted)
Discussion
Benefits and risks

Benefits

• Incentives to publish high impact research "translated" by these organisations to incentives at the level of departments, research groups and the individual researchers
• Potential increase in efficiency / effectiveness of funding : more impact per euro

Risks

• Perverse incentives resulting in undesirable behaviour (e.g. gaming; salami style publishing strategies, scientific fraud, self-plagiarism etc
• Prioritisation of certain fields of research
• Indicators are imperfect: there is a risk to incentivize the wrong thing
Discussion

Benefits and risks

Strengths and drawbacks of peer review

• Grounded in specialised knowledge
• Can help assess elements that are difficult to quantify
• Nuanced understanding of research
• Difficult to implement in countries where the pool of experts is insufficiently large
• Nepotism and a lack of transparency
• Often considered to be conservative, favour mainstream research
• Costly and time-consuming

Strengths and drawbacks of bibliometric approaches

• Low costs both in terms of resources and time (indicator-based)
• Non-intrusive
• Perceived objectivity
• Can involve complex data collection
• Some research outputs are not fully covered by bibliometric databases (Social Sciences)
• Outcomes of bibliometric assessment are sensitive to the methodology adopted and the choice of indicators

Sources include: Wilsdon (2015); Hicks (2008); Hacket (2011)
Key messages

- Introducing/adapting PBF is a potential avenue to improve the efficiency of the research systems of several MS

- Choice for type of system: consider costs, incentives and unintended side effects.

- Case for bibliometrics informed peer review: but costly

- Scope for learning from MS with experience: consider rationale for changes made in the past decade
Austria

- Performance based but not "full RPFB" (Hicks) as no assessment of research performance except PhD completion.
Spain

- No RPBF on the basis of organisational level ex post evaluation of research output (except in some regions)
- System of **individual level assessments** tied to salary bonuses (Sexenio)
- Ex ante selection of **centres of excellence** (Severo Ochoa; Maria de Maeztu)
Norway

- research component (6% of institutional funding) is distributed according to research performance-criteria
  - Scientific publications (counts in **two levels of scientific journals**)
  - PhD candidates; (Competitive) funding; FP Funding
- Haegeland et al (2015) committee advised the gov't on allocation system. No major shift in PBF, but introduction of an **additional performance contract** for 5% of institutional funding.
- **FRIDA**
Denmark

• System similar to Norway
• Publication in journal based assessment
• Different journal tiers based on expert panel assessment
• Introduced gradually, each year 2% of institutional funding allocated: over 10 years a substantial amount
Flanders

- Funding allocation on the basis of sophisticated (biblio)metric assessment
- Since 2003: increasing share of funding
- Attempt to address limitations of bibliometrics for SSH by domestic SSH specific database
• New system since 2009
• increasing share of budget: first 10 then 20%
• Sophisticated Quantitative assessment: including bibliometric: publications/citations (field normalised)
• Plans for a new system based on peer review assessments. Swedish research council proposed the new model under previous govt: timing/implementation unclear
• Initial reform plans: PBF for large share of institutional funding based on quantitative indicators
• After 2016 a new system of RDI evaluation and distribution of organizational funding to be gradually implemented (Srholec, 2015; Good et al, 2015).
• Expectation: metrics informed peer review (Good et al, 2015).
Portugal

- New funding arrangement from 2015 onwards (based on the 2013-2015 evaluation),
- Aims to produce a multi-tiered system of universities.
- Performance based funding system on the basis of a peer review assessment of research units
- Considerable impact on allocation of 70 million Euro
UK

- first EU country to introduce a RPBF system in 1986
- RAE: a peer review process which produces ‘quality profiles’ for each submission of research activity made by HEIs.
- All organisational level funding allocated based on organisational assessment.
- increasing selectivity in the allocation of public resources.
- REF includes societal impact assessments: case studies. Views on this vary depending on stakeholders.
- Discussion of cost
• The VTR had limited financial consequences in comparison to the UK RAE on which it was modelled: only about 2% since 2009
• Since 2014, on the basis of a metric informed peer review exercise called VQR which was coordinated by ANVUR and completed in 2013.
• 185,000 publications by 130 organisations are evaluated partly by international experts and partly by analysis of the citations received
The Australian Research Council PBF system has evolved from:
- a simple bibliometrics approach,
- a ranked journal listing approach similar to Denmark and Norway
- Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) framework in 2012 adopts a metrics based peer review assessment of Fields of Research within an institution
- The Australian government announced the introduction of impact and engagement assessments
- Following a pilot assessment in 2017, national level assessment and reporting will take place in 2018.
- Stakeholder engagement in developing methodologies
Stay in touch

JRC Science Hub: ec.europa.eu/jrc

Twitter and Facebook: @EU_ScienceHub

LinkedIn: europeancommisionjointresearchcentre

YouTube: JRC Audiovisuals

Vimeo: Science@EC